



UNITED STATES RULES AND DIRECTIVES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION NRC
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001 USNRC

2005 OCT 25 AM 9:47

9/8/05

70FR53396

RECEIVED

12

SISf Review Complete

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Template=ADM-013

Adl=
H. Blevins (MXB6)

From: "Elisa Young" <elisay@earthlink.net>
To: <NRCREP@nrc.gov>, "Yawar Faraz" <YHF@nrc.gov>, "Matt Blevins" <mxb6@nrc.gov>
Date: Tue, Oct 25, 2005 12:12 AM
Subject: Fw: ACP DEIS comments

In addition to the questions I sent regarding Envirocare's off-site waste accumulation, I sent an e-mail to the NRC prior to the deadline questioning if the additional DU generated by USEC would be enough to request additional EIS consideration. I believe UDS processing did not have EIS done originally because it was deemed to be of no significant impact. I had asked the DOE before if the additional 200,000 tons from USEC and/ or shipments to Ohio as outlined in LES proposed facility's application, would be sufficient to trigger additional EIS consideration and I was told that it would be. I did not hear a response back from the NRC prior to the 10/24 deadline, only that the person I sent it to was out of town and returning the day after EIS deadline for comments, so I will attach and re-send.

I have been having trouble with my computer. Can you please confirm that you received these by the deadline and that they will be given consideration for the DEIS?

Thank you,
Elisa Young

COMMENTS ON DEIS NUREG-1834

1. Decontamination and decommissioning costs - In table 7-1 it estimates decontamination and decommissioning costs to be \$435 million. There is not a breakdown in the appendix of how this figure was determined and more investigation needs to be done and shared with the public. Taxpayers have almost totally funded these costs for the former facility's operation at the DOE site to the tune of \$300,000,000 (million) annually. The figure provided in this table would not be sufficient. USEC is a private business, generally believed to be in poor financial standing, that recently laid off 150 employees. Approximately the same number of "new" jobs we have been told will be employed in Pike County by the new facility. Taxpayers need solid assurance that we will not be left holding the bag if the facility is shut down, or does not have sufficient funding set aside to cover D&D costs and long term storage and monitoring of radioactive waste it is responsible for generating. How much taxpayer funding is currently being spent to do this work at Paducah and other sites? \$435 million does not reflect the reality of what we are seeing at Piketon. It is grossly inadequate. Since the DOE owns the site that USEC would be operating from, if the company folds, taxpayers would be left with this expense and that is unacceptable.

This table also does not include any cost analysis for long term waste storage. Serious consideration needs to be given and provision made in advance as this is the most expensive cost involved in D&D. The \$300 million taxpayers are currently paying for clean-up does not even begin to touch long-term storage, monitoring, and safety precautions. I asked the DOE for a total of how much taxpayer funding has been spent to date on clean-up, but have never received that information.

The report lists Envirocare as being able to accept unlimited amounts of low-level waste. This contract needs to be signed in advance and paid for. Envirocare is currently accepting so much radioactive waste that they cannot accommodate it - it is being stacked by the side of the road and left for processing. I do not have confidence that by the time this waste is ready to be shipped from Piketon and all of the other sites that are utilizing this landfill have sent what they have there that there will be enough space to accept what USEC would generate and Ohio would be left in the same position it's in now - a stockpile of radioactive waste. This is an environmental hazard and creates a terrorist target in SE Ohio. I sent questions on this earlier to the NRC and was told that the correspondence would be included for consideration in the DEIS, so I won't repeat all of the questions I sent previously.

2. Water resources- The last published DOE annual report for site cleanup progress documented

plutonium contamination and several uranium isotopes found in fish sampled in streams known to be fishing holes for local people - all supposedly at "safe" consumption levels. I had not known previously that there was a safe level of plutonium for human consumption. Uranium was also found in the liver of a deer that had been tested from on site. Currently there is a 3-strand barbed wire fence surrounding the facility. This is not sufficient to keep contaminated water traveling off site, or keeping deer and other wildlife from traveling back and forth, even though the deer hunt was canceled that year. Not much against assurance against potential terrorist entry, either.

A resident that I spoke with told me that he had seen eagles returning to the area, flying over the site boundaries, and feeding from radioactive landfills. What protection is being provided for them, and for people in communities where they may travel off site aside from hunting to die, leaving radioactive contamination to accumulate off-site?

The draft states that groundwater withdrawals would increase by 10 percent over current usage rates, where is it being released? It says that USEC does not anticipate any liquid discharges or radioactive materials from the proposed ACP. What protection or provision is being provided in case of unplanned releases, etc., that may contaminate the water and wildlife traveling on and off-site differently than what was done before? It was apparently inadequate and needs to be addressed. The barbed-wire fence isn't working. Does this study take into account the current level of contamination and that what USEC contributes will be additional?

3. Transportation impacts - With the US having only 2% of the worlds uranium reserves, I believe any meaningful examination of transport of this material needs to include transportation of uranium to the USEC facility from overseas sites it would be coming here from. We had a shipment of uranium for Libya a short time ago and when I asked why this was not included in the EIS for the facility, or UDS facility, they said it was shipped here as a matter of national security and was exempt from that process. Without environmental impact consideration, I believe presents a threat to the security of the communities it is transported across. I know that NRC provides waivers in cases of national security, but if we already know that there is a limited amount of uranium to work with in the US, I believe it is safe to assume some will be coming from overseas, and these impacts need to be considered in the overall picture. I don't see adequate analysis of this in the current DEIS.

I live in an area where coal fired power plants are negatively impacting my community. What electricity is going to be required for USEC's operation? Is EIS being done for our communities from coal-fired power plants? We already have high rates of asthma and cancer. The Gavin plant has been converted to residential use and is no longer available. The first centrifuge took the same amount of electricity to operate as the city of Los Angeles. Where will the energy come from to run ACP, who is paying for it's construction costs, and how will it's operation impact those communities?

No license should be granted for the larger-scale commercial facility under any circumstances until the experimental facility has been constructed, is operating, and proven to be safe and within a realistic budget that USEC can adhere to so that taxpayers are not forced to subsidize private industry. All D&D and long term storage costs should be paid into an account in advance to insure USEC covers these costs.

I have not been able to read through the entire DEIS, and would like additional time to look at the document and submit comments if that is possible.

Elisa Young
48360 Carmel Road
Racine, Ohio 45771

Mail Envelope Properties (435DB0A6.9A8 : 12 : 63912)

Subject: Fw: ACP DEIS comments
Creation Date: Tue, Oct 25, 2005 12:12 AM
From: "Elisa Young" <elisay@earthlink.net>

Created By: elisay@earthlink.net

Recipients

nrc.gov
twf2_po.TWFN_DO
NRCREP

nrc.gov
twf4_po.TWFN_DO
YHF (Yawar Faraz)
MXB6 (Matthew Blevins)

Post Office

twf2_po.TWFN_DO
twf4_po.TWFN_DO

Route

nrc.gov
nrc.gov

Files

MESSAGE
TEXT.htm
Mail
Mail
Mime.822

Size

7779
10312

43292

Date & Time

Tuesday, October 25, 2005 12:12 AM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

From: "Elisa Young" <elisay@earthlink.net>
To: "Yawar Faraz" <YHF@nrc.gov>, "Matt Blevins" <mxb6@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Oct 6, 2005 11:41 AM
Subject: Envirocare/Piketon waste issues

Yawar/Matt:

When I read the transcript of the conversation between Utah Division of Radiologic Control and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission stating that Envirocare was now able to legally accept unlimited amounts of uranium tails/uranium oxides from Piketon, I wrote to the NRC questioning this.

You confirmed that there is no regulatory limit on Envirocare for the total volume of this waste.

This article was forwarded to me from the front page of the Salt Lake City Tribune.

http://www.sltrib.com/search/ci_3077850

Envirocare is receiving so much nuclear waste at this point that they cannot process it, and it is sitting along the side of the road.

Does this violate any department of transportation, storage or other NRC regulations? If not, this needs to be addressed.

In our earlier conversation, you said that applicants are not required to have long-term waste storage contracts in place as part of NRC's licensing process. For approval, the company need only list a site that is accepting the waste.

The Department of Energy stated at a public meeting last year that Envirocare is the site UDS chose to send close to 1 million tons of uranium oxide waste from their DUF6 waste processing facility. They told me that they would provide me with a copy of the letter of acceptance from Envirocare at the meeting, but after repeated requests I have still not received that.

USEC's proposed ACP facility currently under NRC licensing consideration would create approximately 200,000 tons of uranium tailings - also to be sent to Envirocare?

How many facilities, and how much total waste, existing and proposed is currently slated for shipment to Envirocare?

Even if the NRC does not have a regulatory limit, can Envirocare accomodate the total volume of waste being sent (or proposed to send)?

At what volume/threshold can we request environmental impact studies? The transcript of the conversation that I read between the NRC and UDRC included calculations for eventual discharges into the Great Salt Lake, that Envirocare did not have to comply with the usual water regulations because the ground water was not potable beneath the landfill, and that Envirocare did not have to comply with agriculture regulations because it was not surrounded by agricultural activity (even though the transcript documented livestock grazing seasonally - I would assume for human consumption - around the perimeter of the landfill).

According to the article below, the existing waste is not just coming from Piketon, Ohio. The general public does not have access to all of the applications currently under licensing consideration with the NRC.

In light of this, the NRC has a responsibility to take inventory of this situation immediately.

Envirocare should not be rubber stamped as being a feasible option for long-term storage of nuclear waste for USEC's ACP licensing - or any other proposed facilities - until this inventory is taken and that information is available to the public for public comment and input.

http://www.sltrib.com/search/ci_3077850

Sincerely,

Elisa Young

48360 Carmel Road

Racine, Ohio 45771

CC: "Diane D'Arrigo" <dianed@nirs.org>, "Michael Mariotte" <nirsnet@nirs.org>, "Pat Marida" <marida@wideopenwest.com>, "Ewan Todd" <ewan@mathcode.net>, "jean puchstein" <puch2_1999@yahoo.com>, "Deborah Baker New" <deborahbaker@care2.com>, "Bill Price" <bill.price@sierraclub.org>, <marilyn.wall@env-comm.org>, "Earl Clausson" <earlclausson@yahoo.com>

From: "Elisa Young" <elisay@earthlink.net>
To: "Matt Blevins" <mx6@nrc.gov>, "Yawar Faraz" <YHF@nrc.gov>
Date: Fri, Oct 21, 2005 2:17 PM
Subject: Tailings

I am reading through the DEIS, and see that it lists the additional tailings generated by ACP would be processed on site.

Has this already been approved? When we attended the last public meeting with DOE/USEC, we asked if the conversion facility EIS had been done just for the waste on site, or the additional that would be generated. Bill Murphy said it was just for what was currently accumulated. I asked if the additional 200,000 tons either from Ohio or New Mexico (in LES application) would be enough to trigger an additional EIS since the conversion facility is not even built and proven to operate safely yet. Mr. Murphy said that volume could trigger another EIS if we requested.

I would like to request an EIS be done. If there is a formal process or another person I need to address this request to, please send me that information before the opportunity to request it passes.

Elisa Young